DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 111 887 UD 015 315

AUTHOR Wayson, William W.
TITLE Good Multi-Racial and Multi-Ethnic Inservice Programs for Urban Schools.
PUB DATE 22 Feb 75
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of School Administrators (107th, Dallas, Texas, February 21-24, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Administrative Principles; Administrative Problems; Decentralization; Decision Making; Educational Needs; Educational Policy; Educational Problems; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Intergroup Education; Race Relations; School Administration; *School Integration; *Urban Schools; Urban Teaching

ABSTRACT

This paper examines urban schools serving minorities, and begins by arguing that inservice development is the greatest need of the American school system, one that needs many things. The time that a teacher spends in effective inservice activity is more important for the future of pupils than the same amount of time spent with those pupils. Though the impact of formal instruction is as ineffective in an inservice progam as it is in most other settings, a program of formal instruction is an integral part of inservice development. It is held that such a program should be designed to supply instruction in specific skills, attitudes, and knowledge that will complement and reinforce the problem-solving in which staff members are engaged in their daily lives. In discussing the informal inservice climate within the school building and of the school district, the paper emphasizes the role of the principal. It is asserted that no other function gives the superintendent so much power to effect improvements in school districts as the power to appoint and assign school principals. Finally, the paper focuses on the importance of responsible problem-solving at the school building level. Four issues seen as vitally affecting instruction in multiracial and multiethnic school districts are briefly dealt with -- integration, isolation, time, and collective bargaining. (Author/JM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
William W. Wayson
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
107th Annual Convention
Dallas, Texas February 21-24, 1975

ED 111887
VT 015315

SPEAKER: William W. Wayson, Professor of Educational Development, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio

TOPIC: Good Multi-Racial and Multi-Ethnic Inservice Programs for Urban Schools

PLACE: Room N-230, Convention Center

TIME: 10:00 a.m., Saturday, February 22

PROGRAM: Page 48

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ROUGH FIRST DRAFT: Not Verbatim Text: Not for publication in this form. Brief quotations may be made with proper citations.

Charles Silberman wrote a book in 1970 in which he described the general atmosphere of America's classrooms as "grim, joyless" places, governed by "oppressive and petty" rules, in an atmosphere that was "intellectually sterile and esthetically barren". He was indignant because he saw children subjected to mutilation-"Mutilation of spontaneity, of joy and learning, of pleasure in creating, of sense of self." If he thought that instruction in the classroom was that bad, he should see the instruction we give ourselves. Nowhere in American education is instruction so poorly done as when we design it for ourselves. As a consequence most educators think of "inservice" as "a waste of time, unrelated to my work, which hopefully will be entertaining." Small wonder that teachers resist or resent inservice training and seek every opportunity to play truant.

Nevertheless inservice is big business even if poorly run. The Educational Research Service recently reported that inservice training costs a total of $8 billion a year. Some portions of that expenditure go unnoticed because they are in forms not ususally considered inservice. For example, the best attended, most supported, most costly in time and money, least effective inservice efforts in the world are the Masters-degree programs for teachers and other educational specialists. They probably are well supported because they are not thought of as "inservice." They probably are as ineffective as they are for the same reason.

We have too often placed inservice in the hands of the very people whose original teaching created or at least perpetuated problems in the first place. It strikes me funny that it is considered unethical for a teacher to take pay for tutoring one of his students, but no one ever questions a professor charging to be a consultant for his former students. But regardless how bad it is, inservice education may be expected to continue as a major function in the American school system. Indeed, colleges and universities are turning to inservice efforts in an attempt to bolster a market that has sagged because of decline in preservice enrollments. They may find a ready market, because the people in the field, faced every day with weaknesses in the system, are avidly even desperately seeking solutions to the problems they face. The combination of poor results and public pressures assures that inservice will be big business because it is necessary for restructuring and rejuvenating an educational system that lost much public confidence during the 1960's and 70's.

An illustration of the need, to which I will return later in this talk, was stated very well by a teacher participating in a practicum in which another professor and I have consciously structured the physical facilities and both professorial and student roles to force each teacher to define a problem that is real for her (they are all women). They are to go on to identify several solutions to the problem. Then they are to select one that will be put into action before the quarter is over. All of the teachers are engaged in masters or post-masters work. One who already has a masters degree and 8 years teaching experience evaluated the class at mid-term by bluntly stating, "You are assuming that we know how to define a problem, to identify solutions, to select one and then to implement it. You are wrong. None of my training or experience to this point has even hinted that I ought to know how to do those things. This is the first class I have ever had that really demands that I do those things on my own."

So, I come this morning filled with the conviction that inservice development is the greatest need of the American school system that needs many things. I am convinced that the time a teacher spends in effective inservice activity is more important for the future of her pupils than the same amount of time spent with those pupils. Not only in our large city schools serving disadvantaged minorities, but throughout the school system the time spent in personal and professional development for staff members must be greatly increased if American schools are to meet the demands of the last fourth of the 20th century. Moreover, my comments will be as applicable to a suburban school serving caucasian children of professional parents as they are to schools serving a minority ghetto.

A Sober Look At the Urban Schools Serving Minorities

The need for inservice is nowhere as visible as it is in the schools in which minority students are served. Actually, the need does not become visible except in those schools which have a changing school population. We have neglected to enable teachers to understand minority relations both in the schools which have traditionally served only minority students and those schools which never see minority students. But in the desegregated school (whether desegregated through policies, court orders, or natural processes) the need for inservice training is made immediately apparent by visible evidences of conflict and by lack of congruity between the school's traditions and the newly arrived child's lifestyle. Nowhere is the educators' lack of ability to teach children who need teaching more clearly visible. But lack of visibility is not proof that the same deficiencies do not exist in other schools. Once again, the needs of neglected minority students may be the impetus that brings about improved education for students of all other types, if the problems of desegregating focus attention upon the need for effective inservice development of professional skills and attributes that have been neglected throughout the pre-service training programs.

Let us take a sober look at the schools that serve minority students.

Nearly 80% of minority students in the United States are in schools attended mostly by minority students. Most of those schools are in depressed and depressing neighborhoods--crowded, neglected and exploited by every form of economical leech our society can produce: from pimps to politicians, number runners to narcotics agents, ladies of the night to landlords, muggers to manufacturers, evangelists to employers, loan sharks to lawyers, thieves to teachers, rapists to real estate agents. It is a seething, all-encompassing curriculum that teaches fear, insecurity, lack of confidence, worthlessness, alienation, and despair. "Inner-city" is a euphemism for a place where society has forced a bunch of children to live where they are associated day in and day out and at every institution with a densely packed population of people who've been neglected and forgotten by society.

The inner-city is a place where all of the depressing factors in American society wind up in one big mess. It's a place where none of the institutions belong and where far too many of the people who serve the area feel in their hearts that "those people" aren't quite worth the effort anyway. Public servants feel that the residents are there because the residents want to be, not because they've been forced there by extraneous circumstances. If it really is the inner-city it's the bottom end of the totem pole. If it serves immigrant populations like the Irish, the Polish Jews, the Italians and so on -- it's the beginning of something. It takes two or three generations for them to escape, but they generally do. However, if it serves an indigenous population -- that is Native Americans, blacks, Applachian whites -- it tends to be the end and not the beginning.

"Inner-city school" is a euphemism for a place where society forces kids to be in a place that cannot achieve its stated objectives. The society that built the institution is the society that forces the kids into it. The society, or the system, makes it a place where it is very difficult for teachers to feel success and for kids to have success. The slum school is a place where all the ideals of a society come up for tests and fail. It's a place where, if you have a heart, you see human misery perpetuated and the process causes you to lose the enthusiasm, the zeal and the youthful idealism with which you came. You either leave it or turn into a bitter bureaucrat who stops relating to people as human beings and begins to classify them into a few categories, most of which are negative.

The inner-city school is a place haunted by stereotypes. It is seen in an unreal way by everybody, even by the people in it. The stereotypes are all exaggerated. One of the things that destroys the inner-city school's potential in the United States is that the professionals tend to perpetuate the stereotypes. Teachers and administrators go back to their nice bridge club at night and tell "war stories." They tell about the kid who pulled a knife once several years ago. They tell about being scared to death because a little girl in the back of the room called them a name. War stories lend official support to the prejudicial stereotypes that the ignorant listener holds. They also bolster the ego of the person who tells them.

The inner-city school is a place where educators work their hearts out and go home day after day, not seeing the real successes they have had because they are busy looking for some phony successes that people think they have in other schools but for which they are not responsible. An inner-city school is a place to which the kid comes as a respite from the other educational forces in his life. Kids in suburban areas go into the schools already knowing. But in the inner-city we deal with those kids who have not already learned. The inner-city teachers have to count successes in some other way even when they get success in the traditional ways it is easy not to see them because of the expectations that the child ought to already be where he needs to be taught to be.

In short, it is important that we recognize that the typical urban schools serving minority students, whether they are black, Spanish speaking, newly arrived immigrants, Appalachian whites or any other group that is poor -- are not schools in which more than a handful of the superintendents (or the professors) in this country would voluntarily teach or administer for even a single month. Even if they formerly taught in such schools, they would not now want to have to go "back." They certainly are not schools to which those educators will subject their own children.

Thus we are faced with the sobering reality that the inservice efforts we seek to install are designed to help people do that which we would not do. That is a source of great conflict between the school system that initiates inservice programs and the school personnel who must participate in them. That is a major cause for failure in the inservice effort.

So What Can We Do

If those sobering observations have not been too staggering, let us move to some descriptions and prescriptions that might produce an effective staff development program. I use the term staff development here to indicate that we must draw away from the traditional semantic meanings attached to inservice. I also use the term to distinguish staff development as a positive, consciously directed, planned effort to counteract the teachings that are inherent in the everyday functioning of school districts.

Inservice education I would define as any activity or force that influences the adults in a school building to affect their students' learning either by bringing about new behaviors or attitudes or by reinforcing already established behaviors or attitudes. Thus inservice, like all learning, may result in behavior that is positive or negative, conscious or unconscious, planned or unplanned. Inservice education takes place every day whether we will it so or no. The inner-city school has it's own compelling curriculum that presses upon teachers and students alike. Overcoming and transforming that curriculum is a major requirement for any staff development program we create.

Our discussion this morning will focus upon two forms of staff development which are inextricably related. The first, with which we shall deal only briefly, is the formal instructional program which will take place in the form of classes, courses, workshops, faculty meetings, and other traditional forms. The second, which we shall give more attention, is the informal climate of the school district. This division we shall further divide into two parts. The first is the climate within, surrounding and permeating the school building and community. The second is the climate in the school district which shall be represented by the policies and prodedures that are visibly used everyday. These three divisions constitute the outline for the remainder of the discussion.

But before we proceed with that, I must share with you my assumptions about what education is all about, for any instructional activity has to derive from some goal to which we attach value. I will tell you what my goals and values are so that you may examine the subsequent discussion to see to what degree I am true to my goals. Furthermore, you may, if your goals are different, take from the discussion only that which will assist you in achieving what you wish.

It is my opinion that the predictable needs of the next 25 years make it imperative that our schools produce mature adults, persons who can stand confidently, participate fully and learn continually in their world. The responsible citizen-adult has the independence, the freedom and the skills to approach the world as a series of surmountable problems over which he has some control. He has the ability to recognize and choose from a wide variety of alternatives and the strength of character to accept fully the consequences of the actions he takes. This nation cannot risk the dangers of continuing to educate a silent, irresponsible, easily-duped majority.

The one sure thing about the future is that it be filled with changes; hence, our students must graduate with the ability to adapt to and to exert some influence over changing conditions. The inevitable result of that requirement is that the graduate will have to make a variety of choices, the precise nature of which are unknown to his teachers. The process of choice-making should be one of the most important outcomes of education.

It is my belief that all students, and not just a select few, have the ability to develop those skills for more productive citizenship. It is my further belief that the public school is responsible for developing them in all students regardless their background, regardless their political clout, regardless their acceptability to polite society, regardless the difficulties of teaching them. It is my belief that those goals require instruction that engages students in the types of behavior toward which we are striving rather than just telling him about them. He must explore the world of the school and of his community to resolve problems that are relevant to him. He must learn to collect information, explore alternatives, make choices, take action and learn from consequences.

If that is true, then the strongest curriculum we can supply is a staff of adults who do the things that they are trying to teach their students. The staff must engage in adult behavior, must be problem-solving and must bear responsibility for their choices and actions. The staff is best developed to express those skills if it is surrounded by a climate of policy and practice that requires adult problem-solving behaviors related to the daily life in the school. Practicing those behaviors is its own inservice program which serves two purposes simultaneously:

One, it is the process that most effectively helps teachers learn the skills and knowledge for effective professional problem solving:

Two, it effectively teaches students to engage in problem-solving behaviors by surrounding them with teachers who are engaged in problem-solving. It is a living curriculum which focuses upon what should be the major concerns of education in a free nation in the latter quarter of the 20th century.

The Formal Inservice Program

Though the impact of formal instruction is as ineffective in an inservice program as it is in most other settings, a program of formal instruction is an integral part of inservice development. It should be designed to supplement the programs which we shall discuss as being part if the informal climate of the school. It can do that instruction in specific skills, attitudes, knowledges that will compliment and reinforce the problem-solving in which staff members are engaged in their daily lives. The heart of any long-range plan must be to develop school personnel to deal honestly and directly with the issues that confront them in their daily work. They have not generally had any education in how to deal with the issues currently facing schools; therefore, they must fall back upon practices which have little utility unless they are provided a program that makes it possible for them to learn and to engage in appropriate action. The school system, just like a business enterprise that faces new marketing problems, must redevelop its personnel.

The school district might establish an office of Assistant Superintendent in charge of staff development, student relations, and minority curriculum. Or, the school district might assign these functions to appropriate and able assistant Superintendents already on the staff. This office must be installed in the school district in ways that give it more chance for success than the typical emasculated Human Relations offices we've established in the past ten years. The persons who fulfill the functions should be chosen on the basis of having skills to develop effective inservice programs and to communicate well with teachers, students, community members of all types. In larger cities these functions would need to be assigned to the sub-district rather than the central office because it is essential to have the programs and the services closer to the schools.

The functions of this office should be staffed sufficiently and supported financially well enough to provide staff development services to all schools in the jurisdiction. That staff should provide continuing staff development to the schools most affected by minority enrollments. In addition it should provide inter-group experiences for schools that serve predominantly white middle-class students, whose teachers also need instruction in minority relations and in minority contributions to our society. Staff members in this office, supplemented by outside consultants, could provide regularly scheduled courses for the teachers that could strike directly at problems that are keenly felt by teachers and administrators. The state education department and or/some college could be induced to provide credit for such courses if that is felt to be an inducement; though many teachers would take the courses in order to solve some of their everyday problems. The teachers association or union also might sponsor some of these courses. The kinds of experiences that staff members in these cities indicate that they need deal with such topics as:

- The effect of prejudice on one's self and one's pupils
- Inter-group relations and conflict management
- Classroom management (including not only dicipline but new organizational patterns)
- Social class influences upon learning and upon the schools in America
- Black experience, culture and role in America
- Appalachian experience, culture and role in America
- Minority national groups in America
- Organizing schools to teach self-discipline
- Participatory management for schools
- Urban problems in our city
- Problem identification and solution
- Group decision-making.

Obviously the staff development personnel need skills for working effectively with adults and they might be of the type we hope to find teaching college courses, but so seldom do. Some might be recruited from the staff in the school district and others may be found in other places. The staff in this office should have three types of personnel: full-time,part-time, and consultant. Such personnel are now being trained at Eugene, Oregon; Ann Arbor, Michigan; and at Bowling Green and Ohio State in Ohio among other places.

The personnel and human relations office should help school staffs develop power to solve problems. They should provide services to the school faculties beyond the offering of regular courses. These personnel should be selected, educated, and organized for <u>serving</u> school staff members by

1. Supplying human and material resources necessary for better human relations in the school.

2. Securing additional resources upon request from school building staffs. This may be done partly by establishing agreements with other community agencies.

3. Helping school staffs identify problems. They should help people see that something needs to be done, but should not attempt to do it for them.

4. Assisting local staffs in the community to develop skills for solving their problem.

5. Informing the total community about the problems and successes in the school.

6. Holding personnel accountable for better human relations in the school, largely by bringing to their attention the contribution that they make to particular human problems.

7. Continually developing skills and knowledge that will make the central office a source of new and creative ideas and practices for promoting better relations among all parties in the school community.

8. Providing a sounding board for local staffs to test out their ideas and proposals.

9. Protecting the rights of all persons in the schools by acting as ombudsmen throughout the system.

The formal inservice program, of course, is most effective when it is inextricably linked with daily activities. Wherever possible, it is advisable to have teachers and principals who are to engage in an activity participate in planning it themselves. The Columbus Education Association Human Rights Commission, for example, has organized its own set of courses and has recruited university personnel to instruct them. Needless to say, attendance is high and participation is avid. The three courses they have initiated this year were entitled "Dealing with Pressures Upon Teachers," "Teachers as Change Agents," and Teachers Roles in Desegregated Schools." They are currently engaged in writing proposals to secure funding for some intensive retreats designed to prepare teachers to teach in integrated school situations.

Much more should be said about an effective formal instructional program. But since time is limited and any formal instructional program will have extremely little impact unless it takes place in a total organizational atmosphere that supports the instruction, we might more wisely invest this morning's attention in the necessity for creating a supportive climate.

The Informal Inservice Climate Within the School Building

Staff development must focus on matters that have gut level (not mind level) significance for the participant. We have always assumed that teachers were interested in methods of teaching subject matter and that focus upon such methods was the best route to effectively improve educational programs. Nothing could be further from the truth. Teachers generally find instruction in subject matter teaching rather boring; it engages their mind but not their commitment. Furthermore the gut level problems in which teachers engage are much more intense and much more close to home than the problems of teaching subjects.

Too many decisions have been taken from teachers over the past half decade. There is nothing truly important to them or important to their teaching about which they have to make decisions. It is all done for them. The schedule tells them when they will teach. The curriculum and supervisors tell them what they will teach and what materials they may use. The principal or the guidance department tells them who they will teach. There is really nothing important left. When individual problems arise, they are sent to some specialist -- the reading teacher, the guidance counselor, the psychologist, the social worker, the paraprofessional, the visiting teacher, or the Title 92 nose blower.

In large cities the situation is similar for the principal. Nearly all important decisions are made elsewhere, leaving very few out-level, out-grabbing reasons for getting-involved in staff development programs. Each school building should become a place in which teachers, principals, and all other staff members learn to identify real problems--both short and long-term. All staff members are motivated by that involvement to identify several alternative ways to solve those problems, are encouraged to select one of those ways, are enabled to put their choice into effect, and are permitted to learn from the consequences without having their responsibility eroded or usurped in a manner that prevents their facing up to another set of problems. Such a problem-solving climate is essential for the kind of communication, belongingness, and commitment that is necessary for creating a truly educational school. Good schools are, in the words of Silberman, "less an approach or method than a set of shared attitudes and convictions about the nature of childhood, learning, and schooling." Sharing these attitudes and convictions can only take place after many interactions in which the staff tries to apply their philosophies to real live actions in the school and do so in a way that encourages constructive disputation and learning from the consequences of one's choices.

The school organization and administration that takes away the teachers responsibility to make important decisions about the instructional process denies the teachers not only the opportunity to learn skills but deprives them of the personal self-esteem and self-confidence that is essential for good learning and good decision-making. The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights in the book Racial Isolation in the Public Schools pointed out that the weakest link in compensatory education is "in the attempt to instill in a child feelings of personal worth and dignity in an environment in which he is surrounded by visible evidence which seem to deny his value as a person." The report went further to say that better services in a school will be effective "only in a setting which supports the teacher's effort to help each child to understand that he is a valuable person who can succeed." The Commission has stated the essential minimal condition for learning which is that the learner must feel confident that he can exert some control over the environment in which he finds himself. He must feel valuable, and needed. Some call this essential ingredient "self-esteem." Such a condition is also essential for teachers' learning. An effective staff development program must be founded on a climate which places confidence in and imposes responsibility upon teachers as problem-solvers. That, of course, cannot happen so long as teachers are imprisoned in their isolated classrooms and kept from meaningful interaction with other adults.

Many mistakes are made in the process of involving teachers in decision-making. We assume too readily that a faculty or staff is a problem-solving group, when, in fact, most school staffs are a group of strangers who talk to one another only about insignificant matters and interact with one another in shallow ways. They are an agglomeration of strangers. A major purpose of any staff development program must be to create the conditions which enable them, indeed forces them, to become a problem-solving group.

A part of that same error is the assumption that people in a school share a common purpose or understand any common definition of what a statement of purpose means. It is not a problem-solving statement, but a problem-blocking statement, when someone in a group of educators rises to say, "We are all here to serve the children." School personnel often are in a school for many reasons other than serving the children and very few school personnel share in a common meaning of what actions are best serving the children. Any good staff development program must provide an opportunity for people to share their meaning, define their purposes, and debate them as they apply to real life situations in order to hammer out a true sense of common purpose. The two most common causes of ineffective behavior in an organization or a group are (1) Lack of clarity about what the task is and (2) lack of congruence among expectations for what particular people are supposed to do. The inservice development program must

provide an opportunity for clarifying both of those and for establishing common bases from which they will be acted upon.

Staff development in schools too often has focused upon isolated segments rather complete decision units. Staff development is not for teachers alone. Staff development is not for a group of principals called together alone. Rather, effective learning and productive action takes place when the full range of personnel in a school building are engaged in mutual problem definition and problem-solving when their discussions are unhampered by status differences.

We generally do not allow enough time nor do we create the conditions in which groups can form and formulate problem-solving capabilities. I recently met with a group of scholars and principals from around the country to work in a two-day conference to develop recommendations for improving the principalship. It took that group well over half a day to reach a point at which it could make a simple decision to break down into smaller working groups. I was reminded of how frequently the principal will call together a group of teachers and say "We only have 20 minutes but we have to develop this reading curriculum." It is an absurd gesture and is not true problem-solving. The staff development program must permit sufficient time for groups to achieve problem-solving capabilities.

The final problem that we often see in staff development is related to the utilization of leadership. We assume too readily that assigned officials are leaders in the group. However in most city school systems, the principal is a newer arrival than most of the teachers, and he is looked upon as a transient who will be transferred a few months or years from now to another district. If we rely upon assigned officials, then, to carry out the functions of leaders, the group will be denied some very important contributions. We must create opportunities for "natural" (or "emergent") leaders to function effectively and to call together the group contributions in a manner that will be productive.

The Informal Inservice Climate of the School District

The organization and operation of city school districts often works against most of the goals and practices that are necessary for effective staff development. City schools historically were organized to assure maximum control to assure standardized practices. Personnel were selected into building principalships and central office positions because they were loyal to centralized direction over curriculum, finance, personnel, and procedures. Decision-making and problem-solving were functions of higher authorities; thus, few people learned or practiced skills that would make them decision-makers or problem-solvers.

So, the standard operating policies and procedures of the district are a hidden curriculum that teaches teachers and administrators to be obedient, to deny problems, to push decisions upstairs, to play it safe. And that standard operating curriculum works against the welfare of culturally-different students.

Teachers, like any other learners, learn from the world around them. They learn most from the people who are important to them. The teacher who serves minority students is surrounded by a world that justifies actions that harm minority students. The teacher is surrounded by colleagues, bosses, officials, citizens, institutions and policies that hide, ignore, or are blind to actions that detract from the minority student's education and deny him his future. Many of the important others even punish conscientious attempts to assure the student a proper education. This web of standard, acceptable practices and expectations is the hidden inservice program that can defeat all organized inservice efforts to improve education for minority students.

No other inservice program can do so much for so little cost to improve teachers' productivity with their students than creating a climate of policies, procedures, and expectations that unequivocably support teachers whose actions demonstrate faith and respect for their students and unyieldingly prohibit prejudicial, patronizing, humiliating, unfair or miseducational treatment.

In case there is any doubt, let me say succinctly that the standard operating policies and practices in most (but not all) school districts teach personnel to do harmful things to students (particularly minority students) and supports them in doing so.

Let me give just three examples. They came from particular situations, but you can find them in any school system:

(1) Girls in Galoshes

(2) Educator of the Year

[Tell stories from files]

(3) Emotionally disturbed

(4) Madison was a good school to integrate

The major role of the superintendent must be to change the policies and procedures that support personnel in actions such as those. He can do this by clarifying expectations and by establishing explicit procedures which guarantee that clients will get fair and ethical treatment. We should not underestimate the power of the superintendent's and board's expectations because subordinate personnel <u>are</u> highly trained to please authorities.

But we should not rely entirely upon expectations. Veteran school personnel are well equipped to protect their habits. Many an excellent educational leader has had his educational visions destroyed by the people upon whom he had to depend to carry them out. I've seen good educators rendered helpless by the elementary principals, by their own assistant superintendents, or by the P. T. A. in conjunction with key high school principals.

So, the change of climate depends as much on a change of processes and organization as upon expectations. The key is to install practices that push decisions back down in the school system until they are being made closer to the problems and until personnel who make the decisions will learn from the consequences.

There isn't time to treat that very unusual practice in detail. Since it goes against the common practices that have slowly and imperceptible taken away responsibility from teachers, principals, and second- and third-level personnel in the central office, it is tougher to do than it sounds. But there are some school districts that are at various stages of doing it, and we might learn from them. Some that are trying to bring about more responsible problem-solving at the school building level are:

(1) Lansing, Michigan
(2) Nashville, Tennessee (on the way)
(3) Broward County, Florida
(4) Newton, Massachusetts
(5) Berkeley, California
(6) Eugene, Oregon

The general guidelines are clear. They are embodied in these seven general principles:

(1) Everyday practices should cause and support instructional problem-solving in the local school building and its community.

(2) Everyday practices should require teachers to make the decisions about what will enhance learning among the pupils for whom he and his colleagues are responsible.

(3) Everyday practices should secure and develop leadership at all levels of the school district--first, by creating a climate that causes leadership to arise and second, by recruiting and training administrators who can foster that climate.

(4) Everyday practice should permit individual schools and individual groups of teachers within each school to be different from other schools in the district.

(5) Everyday practice should open the schools to creative participation by as many community resources as possible.

(6) Everyday practice should make personnel in the central office serve as staff for principals and teachers.

(7) Everyday practice should place top priority on the quality of service to individual students (no matter what their race, ethnic origins, or financial status).

Although the point cannot be fully developed in this speech, it seems very important to emphasize the role of the principal. Common practice in the principalship does not provide the leadership that is needed, but the evidence of twenty-years of innovation and change in public schools makes it inescapable that the school principal is in the key position for improving practice in America's schools. The normal ways of selecting and appointing principals not only do not assure the leadership or the improvement we need, but they usually undermine it. Relying on that evidence, we can draw one message of importance to school superintendents:

NO OTHER FUNCTION GIVES THE SUPERINTENDENT SO MUCH POWER TO EFFECT IMPROVEMENTS IN SCHOOL DISTRICTS AS THE POWER TO APPOINT AND ASSIGN SCHOOL PRINCIPALS. It is unwise to miss the chance by letting it happen the way it always has.

Before we close this discussion, I want to touch upon four issues that vitally affect instruction in multi-racial and multi-ethnic school districts. The four are: integration, isolation, time, and collective bargaining. I shall touch each only briefly, but I hope with enough insight to lead to greater depth in our questions an answers.

Integration. It was said to a Congressional committee, but it bears repeating over and over again:

> The basic weakness of Title I is that it encourages (though it does not require) that something special be done educationally for disadvantaged children apart from advantaged children. The principal resource public schools can provide for disadvantaged children is close educational contact with advantaged children.

Children in any school learn more from the other children in the school than from all other school resources combined. For an educator to force children into schools where there is not a full-range of experience to be shared among the students is not only denying students their most educational experiences, but it is as educationally unsound and as professionally unethical as though a doctor were to withhold best medical practice simply because his patient couldn't afford it.

I would be negligent if I ignored what all of my personal and professional experience tells me: That minority and dominant-culture students must be educated together if we are to capitalize upon what each has to give the nation. Segregation is the most powerful curriculum for teaching all citizens that minority children are inferior. Desegregation is in itself a powerful positive curriculum for improving life experience for both minority and dominant-culture children.

When desegregation is accompanied by conscious efforts to teach integration, it is extremely productive not only for improved life-experience but for traditional academic learning. Part of those conscious efforts to integrate, of course, is a strong pervasive staff development effort such as we have outlined above.

Isolation. If we truly want to educate teachers (or administrators) to educate minority students, we must not confine our inservice efforts to teaching inner-city teachers to relate better with their students and to do a better job of instructing them. We must also educate every teacher who teaches only children of the predominant culture to recognize that the "problems of the minorities" are problems that they help to create. They must learn how their teaching affects minorities as they pass along their prejudices or do nothing to counteract pervasive societal prejudices among their students who will become the next generation of lawyers, legislators, school superintendents, real estate agents, and employers.

Consequently, our multi-ethnic staff development efforts cannot be isolated and focused only upon staff members who are in daily contact with minority children, although the techniques for staff development probably will differ for staff members who never see minority children.

Time. Nearly every audience I talk to asks, "Where will we get the time to do staff development." If we can agree that staff development is not an extra but vital part of what teachers do, then we can find more time. We can trade off baby-sitting time to get more inservice time. Parents can understand that time spent with children is not well-spent until we have learned more about what we are doing with them. It will be more difficult to get teachers and administrators to see the same point. They believe that they are functioning only when they are with children.

There is a great deal of time that we mis-spend in schools. If we change our priorities toward staff development, we can find time, and much of that time will be considered good use of the normal school day. District-wide "orientation" sessions are an educational waste. Faculty meetings are devoted to routine matters. Large-group instruction, paraprofessionals and volunteers can be used in many ways that free other staff members.

The quality of instruction is in no way related to the time spent in instruction. Acting upon that fact, we ought to be less concerned about how much time is spent in the classroom and much more concerned about finding ways to improve the quality of the time we do spend. We can re-allocate time from classroom coverage to staff development and still do as well--and probably better--in helping students learn.

Collective Bargaining. School principals, particularly the less imaginative ones, tell me that negotiated contracts are preventing them from exercising leadership. They feel that staff development is harmed by contract provisions that limit the numbers and length of meetings they can call. Even though we have to grant that some contract provisions can harm an educational program, there is little truth to what those principals say. Before there was a negotiated contract, those principals were blaming something else for their inability to help their staffs improve their programs. The fact is that the contracts have deprived administrators of nothing but the right to act arbitrarily.

Furthermore, the contracts are decisions in which teachers' organizations have participated; therefore, they share equal responsibility for making them work. The negotiations process can be a way of involving teachers in activities that they historically have felt no obligation to perform. It should be clear from the discussion above that it is highly desirable to have teachers heavily involved in decisions affecting their instructional practices and their own inservice development. For that reason it is highly desirable that the teachers' association or union should be responsible for operating much of the staff development program.

########